

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY DEPARTMENT, )

Appellant, )

v. )

IRMA RACHAL, )

Respondent. )

Case No. ALLO-00-0005

ORDER OF THE BOARD FOLLOWING  
HEARING ON EXCEPTIONS TO THE  
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

**Hearing on Exceptions.** This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair, and LEANA D. LAMB, Member, on the Employment Security Department's exceptions to the Director's determination dated February 11, 2000. The hearing was held on May 11, 2000, in the Personnel Appeals Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington. WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair, did not participate in the hearing or in the decision in this matter.

**Appearances.** Respondent Irma Rachel was present and was represented by Michelle Castanedo, Area Representative for the Washington Federation of State Employees. Appellant Employment Security Department (ESD) was represented by Russ Widders, Human Resource Consultant.

**Background.** On September 14, 1999, Respondent requested reallocation of her Research Analyst 1 position by submitting a classification questionnaire (CQ) to the ESD Human Resource office. Respondent requested that her position be reallocated to the Research Analyst (RA) 2 classification. The CQ was signed by Respondent, her supervisor and her department head. Respondent's supervisor and department head disagreed with her statements on the CQ and attached a CQ that they believed more appropriately described the position.

1  
2 By letter dated October 5, 1999, Appellant ESD denied Respondent' request for reallocation.  
3 Respondent appealed the decision to the Department of Personnel (DOP). The Department of  
4 Personnel received Respondent's appeal on October 11, 1999. The Director's determination was  
5 issued on February 11, 2000 and concluded that Respondent's position should be reallocated to the  
6 Research Analyst 2 classification. On March 10, 2000, Appellant ESD filed exceptions to the  
7 Director's determination with the Personnel Appeals Board. Appellant's exceptions are the subject  
8 of this proceeding.

9  
10 In summary, Appellant takes exception to the Director's designee determination that incumbents in  
11 the RA 1 classification automatically move up to the RA 2 classification upon gaining RA 2 skills.  
12 Appellant also takes exception to the designee's decision to consider only the RA 1 and RA 2  
13 classifications in spite of his statement that the majority of Respondent's duties were described by  
14 the Data Compiler 3 classification.

15 **Summary of Appellant Employment Security Department's Argument.** Appellant asserts that  
16 allocation of a position to the RA 2 classification should not be based on time spent in a RA 1  
17 classification but should be based on the actual duties assigned to and performed by the incumbent  
18 in the position. Appellant argues that the RA 1 classification is intended to cover ongoing lower  
19 level duties such as collecting, compiling and classifying data where as the RA 2 classification is  
20 intended to cover higher-level duties such as making comparisons and interpreting data, providing  
21 narratives, making forecasts, and using macros and other sophisticated approaches to utilize data.  
22 Appellant contends that Respondent's position is responsible for accessing data from existing  
23 sources, entering data into spreadsheets, and producing tables and charts. Appellant acknowledges  
24 that Respondent works independently but contends that her duties and responsibilities are best  
25 described as entrance-level duties. Appellant further argues that at the time of her reallocation  
26

1 request, Respondent's position was best described by the Data Compiler 3 classification, but rather  
2 than allocating her position downward, the agency assured that the majority of her work  
3 assignments would be at the RA 1 level. Appellant argues that Respondent has not been assigned  
4 RA 2 work nor has she gained the skills necessary to perform at the RA 2 level.

5  
6 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that she functions independently and  
7 because of her four years of experience as an RA 1, she has developed RA 2 level knowledge and  
8 skills. Respondent contends that the duties and responsibilities of her position are at the RA 2 level.  
9 Respondent asserts that she collects and compiles raw data, analyses data, breaks the data into  
10 components, inputs data into the computer, and compiles and produces reports. Respondent also  
11 contends that she is responsible for determining how to best display information for reports and  
12 publications. Respondent further argues that reallocation to the Data Compiler 3 classification was  
13 not discussed during the Director's level review and is not a classification that the Board should  
14 consider.

15  
16 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Director's determination that Respondent's position is properly  
17 allocated to the Research Analyst 2 classification should be affirmed.

18  
19 **Relevant Classifications.** Research Analyst 1, class code 04080, and Research Analyst 2, class  
20 code 04090.

21  
22 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
23 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
24 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
25 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
26 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular

1 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
2 class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
3 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

4  
5 This matter comes to the Board under the provisions of WAC 358-30-022 on exceptions to the  
6 determination of the director of the Department of Personnel (DOP). In such cases, the Board  
7 considers the appeal using the same information that was available to the DOP reviewer. Here, the  
8 reviewer chose not to review Appellant's prior decision to allocate Respondent's position to the RA  
9 1 classification. Appellant has not proven that the reviewer erred in making this decision.  
10 Therefore, under the facts presented here, we will not go beyond the scope of the information that  
11 was considered by the reviewer.

12  
13 Furthermore, Appellant has failed to prove that Respondent's position is best described by the RA 1  
14 classification. The distinction between the RA 1 and the RA 2 classification is not well defined.  
15 However, the distinguishing characteristics and typical work provide further clarification of the  
16 intent of the classes. The RA 1 describes positions that perform lower-level basic research,  
17 statistical or data analysis tasks and that assist in gathering and analyzing data and writing reports.  
18 The RA 2 describes higher-level routine work that is performed under established procedures.  
19 Positions at the RA 2 level also work under limited supervision, have responsibility for delegated  
20 duties and have acquired a higher-level of statistical and/or computer skills.

21  
22 Respondent works independently and has responsibility for the duties assigned to her. She has been  
23 performing research, statistical and data analysis duties utilizing the Excel and PowerPoint  
24 computer programs for four years and therefore, has acquired a higher-level of statistical and  
25 computer skills. Furthermore, Respondent follows established procedures, accesses data from  
26 computer files, and uses computer programs to generate reports as described by the distinguishing

1 characteristics of the RA 2 classification. Therefore, Respondent's position is best described by the  
2 RA 2 classification.

3  
4 **Conclusion.** The appeal should be denied and the Director's determination, dated February 11,  
5 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

6  
7 **ORDER**

8 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of the Employment Security  
9 Department is denied and the determination of the Director, dated February 11, 2000, is affirmed  
10 and adopted. A copy is attached.

11  
12 DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2000.

13 WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

14  
15 \_\_\_\_\_  
16 Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 Leana D. Lamb, Member

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
Personnel Appeals Board  
2828 Capitol Boulevard  
Olympia, Washington 98504